

-15-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 10, 2007, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claims 1, 2, 6-16, 18 and 22-37 now pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 15 and 29-31 independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

In this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 13, 15, 25, 27 and 29-31 have been amended and claim 10, 12, 24 and 26 have been canceled. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-16, 18, 22-25, 28 and 30 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** as being obvious over Hefetz et al, U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0123238 (hereinafter Hefetz '238). in view of Ehrling et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0097008 (hereinafter Ehrling '008).

Ehrling is cited for the proposition that it teaches building (rendering) the output page as recited in Claim 1. The Office Action suggests that the Ehrling '008 system invokes rules similar to the claimed rendering (Citing Hayton at p.6 l. 1- Applicant assumes this refers to Ehrling '008). The Ehrling '008 rules, however, refer to runtime behavior of the implemented application. Thus, the Ehrling '008 rules handle interactive user conditions and situations, as disclosed at paragraphs 0083-0086. In contrast, the rules in the present application are syntax rules 64 which define the arrangement of the parsed tokens 30, as disclosed at page 11, lines 18-22, and further at page 15, lines 20-27. As such, the syntax rules regulate pre-runtime coding of the tokens, not the runtime behavior of the application as in Ehrling '008. Accordingly, one of skill in the art would not look to Ehrling to modify Hefetz '238. Further, even if Hefetz were modified according to Ehrling, the result would not anticipate claim 1 for the following reasons.

The claimed invention renders a page by first invoking javabeans to produce JSP syntax from the parsed XML descriptors 62, and then inserting the produced JSP syntax as content portions 58 generated by the javabeans, as disclosed at page 16, lines 4-18. The claimed approach differs from the cited Ehrling '008 system because Ehrling performs runtime evaluation of the XML descriptions of possible behavior based on the rules [0174]. Ehrling therefore differs because Ehrling '008 does not show, teach, or disclose invoking javabeans to produce JSP syntax from the parsed XML descriptors 62. Ehrling only performs rule selected behavior after displaying and considering user activity based on the rules, and does not invoke an intermediate javabeans processing step.

In contrast, the claimed approach first invokes javabeans to process the page descriptors pointed at by the parsed tokens (page 15, lines 6-27), and then assembles the dynamic portions to complete the page rendering, disclosed at page 16, lines 9-16. Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claims 10 and 12, to recite metadata token corresponding to a javabeans component such that parsing further comprises identifying the javabeans component, the javabeans component operable to process the metadata token, retrieving, from a metadata repository, by the javabeans component, metadata components corresponding to the metadata tokens and operable to provide the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata tokens, processing the metadata component by the javabeans component, and then retrieving, based on the metadata components, the display data and the output data from a repository, the display data and output data corresponding to the dynamic content for rendering on the output report, processing the metadata components using the retrieved display data and output data to generate the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata tokens for inserting the dynamic content in the output report by replacing the metadata tokens, as now recited in amended Claim 1.

The Office Action suggests that Hefetz teaches the subject matter of claim 10. However Hefetz is concerned with displaying pages having dynamic content representations 130 ([0025-0026]), and with application runtime population of these representations [0029], but not with rendering using processing of metadata components such as by javabeans, as in amended claim 10.

The Office Action suggests that Hutsch '771 (U.S. Pub. No. 20010034771) teaches the javabean processing of claim 12, now amended into claim 1. Hutsch, however, invokes javabean processing for actual runtime execution, not for generation of code to render the dynamic content, as claimed in claim 1. The system of claim 1 claims javabean invocation for processing metadata components OPERABLE TO generate the dynamic content. Thus it is the metadata components generated by the javabeans that display the dynamic content, a feature not shown, taught, or suggested by Hutsch. Hutsch, in contrast, executes javabeans for actual execution at runtime ([0103, 0106]) Further, one of skill in the art would not look to Hutsch to modify either Hefetz of Ehring because Hutsch teaches a network portal, not a web page generation or rendering application.

Claim 15, reciting features similar to claim 1, has been amended to recite features of claims 24 and 26, similar in scope to claims 10 and 12, respectively, and is therefore deemed allowable for the reasons put forth above. Claims 29-31, rejected on similar grounds as claim 1, have been similarly amended.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15 and 29-31, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the case are now allowable.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-18-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/CJL/

---

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No.: 44,883  
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, Massachusetts -01581  
Telephone: (508) 616-9660  
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: SUN03-12(040036)

Dated: April 18, 2008